REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-27 are pending. Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 4-6 and 8-10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of this claim in this or another application. Claims 14-27 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter these claims in this or another application.

In accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, claims 4 and 8 have been rewritten in independent form to include all the features of their individual base claims and any intervening claims. It now believed claims 4 and 8, and any claims depending directly or indirectly from these claims, to be allowable.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 11 and 12 have been each amended to change their respective dependencies. Claim 3 has been further amended to recite "said bottom wall and extending" as suggested by the Examiner. These amendments are merely formal in nature and not related to patentability.

Accordingly, no new matter has been added by these amendments and no estoppels are intended thereby. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

OFFICE ACTION

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 3 has been amended to recite "said bottom wall and extending" in line 2. Applicant respectfully requests that this objection to claim 3 be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

(1) Claims 1-3 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cates et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant notes that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. (quoting *Verdegall Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California,* 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

Without conceding the propriety of the prior art rejection, claims 1 has been cancelled rendering this rejection moot with respect to this claim. Claims 2, 3 and 7 have been amended to depend from independent claim 4, which was indicated allowable by the Examiner if rewritten in independent form to include all the features of the base claim. In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form to include all the features of cancelled claim 1, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3 and 7 are allowable for at least this reason. Accordingly, withdrawal of this 102 (b) rejection to claims 2, 3 and 7 is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Cates et al. taken together with Forchini et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 11 and 12 have been amended to depend from depend from independent claim 4, which was indicated allowable by the Examiner if rewritten in independent form to include all the features of the base claim. As previously mentioned, claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form to include all the features of cancelled claim 1, and therefore it is respectfully

submitted that claims 11 and 12 are allowable for at least this reason. Claim 13 as originally presented depends from claim 12 and believe allowable for at least these reasons.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS

Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of cancelled claim 1 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Claim 8 now believed in condition for allowance. Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim and are believed allowable for at least this reason.

No extension-of-time fee is believed due. However any extension of time necessary to prevent abandonment is hereby requested, and any fee necessary for consideration of this response is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account Number 50-2036.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the application are believed in order, and such action is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite issuance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at 202/861-1714.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Stephen S. Fabry
Registration No. 51,661

Date: November 7, 2003
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel. 202 861 1500
Fax. 202 861 1783